I oppose Bill No. 6656.

I ask, how does this reduce or stop crime? It doesn't. Criminals by definition don't care about the law or others and will not purchase insurance for their illegal activities. In fact, they can see this as an incentive. Should you injure them during their assault on you, they know they have a possible legal paycheck coming their way.

My right to defend myself is innately God-given and free. This bill says I have to pay for that right. Every woman in this state is a potential rape victim. Should we get similar insurance should we injure our attacker?

This proposal is punitive and stigmatizing. It puts an undue financial burden on those law-abiding gun owners who can afford it the least but need to be able to defend themselves the most. In particular, families who live in lower income communities that typically have higher crime rates. They can't afford to move, but they can afford a firearm. Now, this bill wants them to sacrifice maybe a month or two worth of groceries every year for the right to protect themselves and their loved ones.

Clerks in convenience stores, gas stations and the like frequently have baseball bats or golf clubs within reach to be able to defend themselves. Shouldn't ownership of those items also require insurance to own? What about mace or wasp spray? Ask any military, any law enforcement and many civilians "What is a weapon?". They will tell you "anything I can use". This pen can be used as a weapon. Do I need insurance to have this?

I don't yet have the statistics for Connecticut cases of individuals who defended themselves from an assailant going to court to defend their actions, but since the news media hasn't been showing that, I assume it is low if at all. The same holds true the liability aspect. I will find this data and forward it to you by the end of the week.

This bill does nothing to make the community safer. I urge you to oppose this bill and any potential spin-off.

Thank you.

Respectfully, Karen Zalewski Meriden, CT 06450